1604/5006

OBSERVATIONS

ON

SOME PASSAGES IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF

A

CITIZEN OF DUBLIN, LATELY DISFRANCHISED

IN A LETTER FROM

HYPODIDASCALUS

TO THE

Right Honorable B. LORD YELVERTON.

" As for the ſenſe and reaſon of it, that has little or nothing to do here; only let it ſound full and round, and chime right to the humour which is at preſent agog; (juſt as a big long rattling name is ſaid to command even adoration from a Spaniard) and, no doubt, with this powerful ſenſeleſs engine, the *rabble driver* ſhall be able to carry all before him." SOUTH'S SERMONS.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED IN THE YEAR

1800.

BRITISH MUSEUM
15
71
DEC

OBSERVATIONS,

&c. &c.

MY LORD,

YOUR Lordſhip was lately pleaſed, as it has been reported, to pronounce an eulogium * on the principles and conduct of a diſfranchiſed member of the Corporation of Dublin, ſome part of whoſe various publications, or at leaſt of the publications which have been circulated in his name, will make the ſubject of the following Review. The conſequence beſtowed on this Gentleman by your Lordſhip's applauſe, is the ſole cauſe of the preſent attempt. Had he been permitted to remain under the ſhade, in which the contempt of his country had caſt him, had not the glare of your Lordſhip's panegyric broken through that gloom, he ought to have been permitted to paſs his

* "I have lived to ſee an illuſtrious friend of mine at one time idolized as a deity, and at another diſfranchiſed as a traitor; the act of an intemperate corporation, whoſe cenſure could no more depreciate, than their applauſe could enhance the value of ſuch a character, which will always ſuſtain itſelf."

PAMPHLET, ENTITLED, THE SPEECH OF LORD YELVERTON, P. 25.

life in that degree of gratification, which ſolitude and obſcurity always afford to a ſordid temper. It would be a wanton inſult to queſtion either your Lordſhip's ſincerity, or your innocence, in what it has been reported you have ſaid, as it was purely voluntary, and neither directly or collaterally connected with your argument.

THE ſtamp of your Lordſhip's high authority, muſt undoubtedly give currency to any opinion which bears ſo reſpectable an impreſſion. It has done ſo in the caſes of thoſe perſons, who have hitherto enjoyed the happineſs of your Lordſhip's confidence, and the advantage of your Lordſhip's protection. Without the aſſiſtance of that awful ſtamp, few perſons in this land would have conceived that your Lordſhip's acknowledged counſellors and intimates, Bartle Hoare, and Jack Egan, were equally fitted in point of morals for the ſcrupuloſity of Arch-biſhop Tillotſon, and in graceful accompliſhment of manners to the almoſt *mimoſatic* diſcrimination of Lord Cheſterfield; yet, my Lord, who will now queſtion your Lordſhip's judgment in theſe inſtances? None, my Lord. It is therefore devoutly to be expected, that preciſely the ſame degree of deference will be paid by the public judgment to this recent opinion with which, as with a "* veil of light," you have endeavoured to ſurround our late (now diſfranchiſed) fellow-citizen, as has hitherto been given to your Lordſhip's approbation of the two worthy perſonages whoſe names I have mentioned.

BUT, my Lord, though acquieſcence in your judgment may

* To any perſon illuminated by the glare of his Lordſhip's approbation, the remainder of that beautiful paſſage may well be applied:

"Myſterious *veil*, of *brightneſs* made,
"That's both his *luſtre* and his ſhade."

HUDIBRAS.

BRITISH MUSEUM 15 71 DEC

may be general, it is poſſible, ſuch is the whimſical compoſition of human nature that it may not be univerſal. It ought however to be made as general as poſſible. The disfranchiſed citizen, in his laſt publication, called, an "anſwer to a pamphlet, entitled, the Speech of the Earl of Clare," has ſaid, "that he will take no notice of any anſwer, except one coming from the author" of the pamphlet to which he alludes. Such an opportunity of following his ſubject, he was well aſſured, would never be given to him; how, therefore, are latent objections, (ſuch there may be, however futile,) which may, moſt injurioufly to his character and conduct, be circulated, to be expoſed and ſilenced? By no other method, than by ſome perſon as diſintereſtedly zealous in the cauſe of truth as your Lordſhip, collecting all ſuch objections in one point of view, and giving them their full force, in order that your Lordſhip, aſſuming to yourſelf the ſame office for the disfranchiſed perſonage, as Philo-Junius did formerly for a much more eminent maſter of vituperation, may have an opportunity of doing that for this ſubject of your applauſe, and object of your admiration, which, by his own determination, he is precluded from the poſſibility of doing for himſelf.

It is now my intention, my Lord, to afford your Lordſhip that opportunity, and, in doing ſo, I ſhall commence with ſome obſervations on the pamphlet, entitled, an anſwer to the pamphlet, entitled, the ſpeech of the Earl of Clare.

The pamphlet alluded to enters into an examination, not merely of the truth of the aſſertions made in the ſuppoſed ſpeech of Lord Clare—not merely into a refutation of the arguments founded upon the facts ſtated, but alſo into a critical inveſtigation of the merits of the ſtyle, and the manner in which the ideas of the writer are conveyed, and thoſe arguments of his are arranged.

Just taſte is the ſpirit, and philological knowledge is the ſubſtance of true criticiſm. Bombaſt can never be held up as a light to detect confuſion; and to blunder in the purſuit of inaccuracy, excites contempt inſtead of producing conviction.

Of the manner in which the pamphlet, called Lord Clare's ſpeech, is written, perhaps, the greateſt praiſe is, that ſtyle ſeems to have been the ſmalleſt object of the writer. The ſtyle ſeems to be a mere inſtrument, ſuddenly ſeized by a lively temper, to convey, in the fulneſs of its colouring, and the preciſion of its form, to the perception of the reader, that picture, which was vividly impreſſed on the mind of the writer. Sound knowledge, and conſtant exerciſe, afford a releaſe from the immediate tenſion of thought, and give an opportunity of aſſuming all the eaſe of careleſſneſs, without the hazard of appearing ſlovenly.

These ſeem to have been the habits and powers of the writer of the pamphlet called Lord Clare's ſpeech. The mind, while it was engaged in the compoſition, appears to have been too conſcious of its own vigour, to have ſtooped to guard againſt the queruloufneſs of little obſervation, and too proud of its own ſtrength of thought, to deſcend to any ſubordinate diſplay in the trick of artificial compoſition. That praiſe however may be fairly given to it, which is moſt truly deſerved, where perhaps it has been leaſt ſought. It may be ſaid of the language of this ſpeech, as was ſaid of the proſe of Dryden, " that it has " not the formality of a ſettled ſtyle, in which the firſt " half of the ſentence betrays the other. The clauſes " are never balanced, nor the periods modelled; every " word ſeems to drop by chance, though it falls into its " proper place." " Nothing is cold or languid." " Nor " does

" does the writer appear to have any other ART, *than that of* " *expreſſing with clearneſs what he thinks with vigour.*"

SUCH a ſtyle affords but little ſpace for the exerciſe of mere verbal criticiſm. Every particular word is involved in the general chain of thought, and, to judge of the ſtyle, requires to be a maſter of the argument.

BUT the compoſition of the animadverter himſelf affords a different field. Here, inſtead of attention going unrewarded from the paucity of peculiarities, the critic ſtands like a greyhound in a deer-park, motionleſs, and confounded by the diſtracting variety of his natural game. A ſelection therefore of a few out of the many muſt be made, or all muſt be given up.

THE firſt charge made on the writer of the pamphlet, called Lord Clare's ſpeech, is barrenneſs of invention, and triteneſs of expreſſion.

IN ſupport of this charge, the critic obſerves (p. 1) " What was long known by many men, many women, and " many children," &c. &c.

THIS firſt ſneer of this moſt learned critic, is itſelf a direct plagiariſm, viz.

BOZZY. Sir, I believe very *few men* could have invented ſo fine a ſimile.

JOHNSON. Yes, Sir, *many men, many women, and many children.*

ANECDOTES OF S. JOHNSON, L.L.D.

WHAT will be thought of the meanneſs and audacity of that mind, which can publicly charge another with want of

of the power of invention, and at the ſame inſtant be reduced to borrow its own little fund of petty ſneer from ſuch a banker as poor Bozzy? It is Auncient Piſtol filching from Corporal Nym.

AGAIN (p. 6) " Wrap himſelf in the thread-bare cloak " of zeal for the empire, and ſtab his country to the " heart."

" WRAP himſelf up in the thread-bare cloak of zeal for " the conſtitution, and ſtab his country to the heart."

LORD BOLLINGBROKE DISSERT. ON PARTIES.

THE theft is clear, not merely of phraſe, but of argument and metaphor; and changing the word " *conſtitution*" into the word " *empire*," marks the conſciouſneſs of petty fraud.

AGAIN, (ſame page,) " Such arguments are not to " be anſwered, but puniſhed."

" Such arguments ſhould not be anſwered—they ſhould " be puniſhed."

POLITICAL TRACTS BY S. JOHNSON, L.L.D.

THIS ſort of open day-light theft, (and upon next door neighbours too,) is equally a mark of poverty of reſource, and of a profligate diſregard of literary character.

School helps he wants to climb on high,
Where all the ancient treaſures lie;
And there, unſeen, commit a theft
On wealth in Greek Exchequers left,

OR elſe——

THE next obſervation, which will preſs itſelf on any mind habituated to correctneſs in compoſition, is the total ignorance which this learned critic exhibits of the nature

of

of the ordinary terms of our languge, and of the regular combinations of Engliſh ſtyle. Take the following out of many inſtances, (p. 8:) "And, certainly, *its falter* in "fact muſt prejudice its authority in logic" Your Lordſhip well knows there is not ſuch a *ſubſtantive* in the Engliſh language as *falter*; nor can the word be uſed ſubſtantively, without an abſolute blunder, without confounding the neceſſarily diſtinct ideas of action, and of the ſubſtance acting. In the ſame ſentence, in the phraſe "authority, in logic," the critic confounds cauſe and effect. An argument is the *effect* of the ſcience of logic, having its principles practically applied to a particular ſubject. But it is a blunder to confound the practical *effect*, whether perfect or imperfect, with the abſtract ſcience, or *cauſe*, from which the effect proceeds. Suppoſe a cuſtomer were to carry his watch to Mr. Croſthwaite, the watch-maker, and ſay to him, Sir, the *falter in fact*, of this watch, muſt prejudice its authority in geometry. I believe that reſpectable citizen, and very ingenious mechanic, would ponder for ſome time before he could diſcover that his rhetorical cuſtomer intended to inform him, that the watch told the hour falſely.

HERE then this learned critic appears to have confounded the common diſtinctions of language and of thought, in order to produce a contemptible antitheſis in the conſtruction of a ſaucy ſentence.

ANOTHER trick of this learned critic, and a trick by which he certainly riſes into peculiarity, though never into ſtrength of expreſſion, is to apply ſome epithet in a way in which it was never applied before. As, for inſtance, in the following ſentence (p. 39:) Parliament (that is the Iriſh Parliament) had repoſed in the liberality of the Britiſh Parliament an INEXORABLE *confidence*. Hitherto, my

Lord,

Lord, wherever the word *confidence* has been uſed to expreſs that ſoftneſs and generoſity of heart which repoſes an implicit belief in the integrity of another, the epithet of *inexorable* has never been applied to it. But wherever hereafter the word confidence ſhall be uſed to expreſs that vicious boldneſs, which indicates a ſaucy and falſe opinion of one's own excellence, it may fairly (upon the authority of our critic) and without any antiperiſtaſis of words, be entitled to the epithet of *inexorable*. For inſtance, my Lord, if any man ſhould have acted ſuch a part as to incur expulſion from the firſt corporations in the kingdom, as a fomenter of ſedition,—and if, when his fellow-ſubjects, of the moſt peaceable, even of ſacred profeſſions, were obliged to defend their king, their country, their wives, and their children, by encountering the hazards, and enduring the hardſhips of common ſoldiers,—ſuch a man ſhould have fled from that country, and ſhould have ſhrunk from the danger which he had ſo eminently contributed to produce, —and if ſuch a man, after the victory over rebellion had been gained by other hands than his own, and when life could be once more enjoyed without hazard, ſhould return to his native country, and ſhould again aſſume the trade of a noiſy and turbulent rhetorician,—and if ſuch a man, under ſuch circumſtances, ſhould preſume to talk either of his ſpirit or of his loyalty, would he not be conſidered as a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *confidence?*

If any man, my Lord, ſhould have been brought forward on the public ſcene, by the power of thoſe whoſe ſhallow judgments led them to miſtake malignancy of temper for vigour of imagination, and hardihood of ſelf-confidence for determination of ſpirit; and, if ſuch a man ſhould have been inſtantaneouſly dragged from the abjectneſs of poverty, and elevated to the pride of wealth by the ſilly

laviſhneſs

laviſhneſs of a reward, to which neither natural talent, nor acquired knowledge had given either claim or title; and if ſuch a man, in the anxious enjoyment of wealth, ſhould be known to his tenants in no other form than as the *inexorable* receiver of his half years rents,—if ſuch a man ſhould notwithſtanding, become and continue the whining preacher on the miſeries of the poor, without one trace of his own individual benevolence ever having been diſcovered—and if ſuch a man ſhould continually exhibit himſelf as the public declaimer for general liberty, while the whole web of his own life was a warp and weft of avarice preying on the poor, and of inſult daſhed againſt the rich;—would not ſuch a man, my Lord, from ſuch a conduct, be conſidered as a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *conſidence*?

If any man ſhould in any regulated monarchy, publicly call "loyalty" "apoſtacy," and ſhould afterwards dare to denominate himſelf a good ſubject, would not ſuch a man be deemed a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *conſidence*?

If any man ſhould call the conſequence of the exertions of the King's troops in the ſuppreſſion of rebellion, by the name of "*military murder*," and ſhould at the ſame time denominate the ſlaughter committed by aſſaſſins in unprovoked rebellion, by the terms of "*civil indiſcretions*,"—and if ſuch a man ſhould afterwards dare to make any pretenſions to humanity, would he not be conſidered as a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *conſidence*?

If any man ſhould have deſcribed the gallant exertions of the gentry of this land, in endeavouring to preſerve from the fury of myriads of unprovoked and blood-thirſty ſavages, his crown for their king, and their domeſtic hearths for their wives and children, by the terms of "*employing*

" *the rich like a pack of Government blood-hounds, to hunt down* " *the poor*"—and if ſuch a man, after having himſelf ſhrunk from the hazard of the war on either ſide, ſhould, upon its ſuppreſſion, return again, and venture to take a ſeat amongſt the firſt aſſembly of that very gentry, whom he had ſo deſcribed, would not ſuch a man, my Lord, be conſidered as a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *confidence?*

If any modern Therſites ſhould dare to calumniate the Majeſty of his Sovereign, by proclaiming that his " *King* " *was put at the feet of France*," (addreſs of 1797, p. 46,) would it not, my Lord, be conjectured that his truth was as viſible in the expreſſion of his wiſhes, as his falſhood was palpable in his declaration of the fact; and if ſuch a man, after ſuch a declaration, ſhould preſume to look any brave and loyal ſubject in the face, would he not be conſidered as a man of the moſt INEXORABLE *confidence*?

I have now done with ſuch obſervations, on the ſtyle of this production of your Lordſhip's " illuſtrious friend," as I propoſed to offer to your Lordſhip's conſideration. I have no hope of receiving an anſwer, as the " illuſtrious" critic has declared he will not take notice of any perſon, except the author of the pamphlet called Lord Clare's ſpeech. It would be ſome ſatisfaction however to curioſity, if your Lordſhip, condeſcending to imitate Philo-Junius, were to take the trouble of giving an anſwer to the foregoing queſtions.

Having done with the philological part of the " illuſ- " trious" critic's pamphlet, I ſhall turn with ſome ſatisfaction to the obſervations which he has made on the hiſtorical and argumentative parts of the publication called Lord Clare's ſpeech.

The firſt charge of this " illuſtrious" critic and hiſtorian, againſt the ſtatement of the Iriſh hiſtory in the pamphlet,

pamphlet, is, (p. 1) that there is " much *miſrepre-* " *ſentation*, no new diſcovery, no new remark; the ter- " mini, or land marks of hiſtoric knowledge, remain " *preciſely as they were in their old ſober ſtation*" How, if there be " much miſrepreſentation", the hiſtorian could contrive ſo to *miſrepreſent*, and yet at the ſame time leave the limits of hiſtoric knowledge " *preciſely as they were*, " in their *old ſober ſtation*, " may perhaps puzzle my reader, unleſs you, my Lord, who have declared yourſelf the foremoſt admirer of the talents and virtues of this " illuſtrious" critic, ſhould deign to afford that aſſiſtance, which I profeſs myſelf utterly unable to give. That part of the charge which does not contain a contradiction to itſelf, I ſhould be much inclined to admit the truth of, if it were not for a ſmall grammatical inaccurary in the uſe of his tenſes, which, in ſpite of the labours of the illuſtrious critic, ſeems to have crept into his ſentence. Had he ſaid, that the hiſtorian placed the " land-marks of hiſtoric knowledge " preciſely as they HAD ſtood," (inſtead of as they were) " and in their old ſober ſtation," I ſhould have agreed with the aſſertion; becauſe I conceive that the ſole labour (and a more truly praiſe-worthy labour can ſcarcely be conceived) of the author of the pamphlet, called Lord Clare's ſpeech, was to *reſtore* the " land-marks of hiſtoric knowledge" to thoſe places whence, after they had remained fixed for ages, they had been profligately uptorn, and ſcattered to the winds by the modern labours of one Doctor M'Nevin, one Counſellor Emmett, one Counſellor O'Connor, and one Henry Grattan, with the aſſiſtance of an inſtrument called the " Preſs;" which inſtrument, I find, in an addreſs (p. 36) from ſome one of the various Henry Grattans to his *fellow*-citizens, (who ſoon after, I hear, disfranchiſed him, leſt he ſhould attempt to call them *fellow*-citizens again.) Mr. Henry Grattan charges in terms of bitter

lamentation, the government, or parliament of this country, with having ſuppreſſed*. In this honorable labour, the author of the ſpeech ſeems ſucceſsfully to have employed acquired knowledge and natural talent; and however high his rank, and however other eminent ſervices may have elevated him, he will not, I think, conſider as the loweſt of his honours, to have recalled to the minds of many of our volatile and miſinformed countrymen, thoſe ſober truths (" *the termini, or land-marks of hiſtoric knowledge*") which had been formerly well known to "many men, "many women, and many children," amongſt our anceſtors; and from the ſober dignity of whoſe virtues we have fallen, in proportion as thoſe truths, which the "illuſtrious" critic ſays, were ſo very familiar to them, have been obliterated from our minds by depraved induſtry, and inventive vice. Surely the author of the ſpeech, whoever he may be, poſſeſſes too wiſe a head, and too good a heart, to conſider, as a reproach, a charge (coming under the name of Mr. Henry Grattan too) that he has in this eventful hour, and in this hitherto much miſguided period, given to us "the compendium of the ſtudies of our childhood, "for the amuſement our age;" that he has, by an animated ſurvey of our hiſtory, impreſſed upon our minds that ſeries of facts which we ought never to have forgotten, and has put it into our power to avoid the evil, and to cheriſh the good which our anceſtors have either ſuffered or enjoyed.

If the times were ſo portentous, my Lord, as to exhibit to us a nobleman, not the growth of yeſterday, but of deep rooted family, of the moſt extenſive property, and of the higheſt rank—a nobleman, whoſe proud integrity, as it had hitherto give public dignity to the government he ſupported,

* Northern Star.

ported, ſo his domeſtic chearfulneſs, gracious manners, and warm affections, had given unuſual charms to family intercourſe, and unuſual value to private connexion: If we had ſeen ſuch a man, my Lord, ſo completely caught in the whirlwind of temporary politics, as to be turned directly againſt the pure ſtream of public principles, which, like his honours and his fortune, had flowed to him in hereditary deſcent—if we had ſeen ſuch a man, my Lord, ſo entirely reverſed, as to ſeek out for a practiſing lawyer, not even perſonally known to him, and lift him from the obſcurity of his deſk, upon no other recommendation of paſt conduct, than his having been the firſt to ſummon a military body to take the meaſure of Union into conſideration *à la bayonette*, and upon no other hope of future exertion, than as he had derived his deſcent from one country, and claimed his birth in another, he might probably combine the *head* of a *French* metaphyſician with the hand of an *Iriſh* incendiary, and ſo the more effectually ſcatter his poiſons among the vulgar herd—in ſuch times, and ſurrounded by ſuch circumſtances, would not your Lordſhip think it an honeſt and an honourable employment, to call with the voice of authority the attention of mankind to the "*old ſober ſtation*" of exiſting fact, and to labour for the preſervation of the "*termini, or land-marks of hiſtoric* "*knowledge*?"

My Lord, when I call your Lordſhip's attention publicly to any character, do me the juſtice to think that I mean to go no further than to his public conduct. I allude in terms of blame to no man's private character—nor need I. I have ſaid, that this man was called forth to *ſcatter his poiſons among the vulgar herd.* I think ſo, becauſe I know he did ſo. But Ulyſſes, your Lordſhip knows, was a *wiſe* man, and was moreover a good huſband, a

good

good father, and a kind maſter; yet, my Lord, he did not ſcruple ſometimes, for *public* purpoſes,

——— Spargere voces
In vulgum ambiguas ———

It has been obſerved by ſome, who have bent an acute eye on life and manners, that men who have originally ſet out with attempts at deceit, do grow by habit ſo completely callous, that they totally forget how much the attainment of their end depends upon the concealment of their means. Hence it is that a man, pretending to be a popular leader, and finding great profit in the profeſſion, and having indulged himſelf in the conſtant practice of perverting every leſſon of hiſtory as his invention led him, to encourage the mobbiſh trade, conceives at length that fiction muſt be a neceſſary ingredient in the compoſition of all hiſtory, and does not ſcruple openly to avow, that he conſiders an adherence to truth as a defect of talent. In the "illuſtrious" critic's anſwer, your Lordſhip will obſerve, he is pleaſed firſt to charge the author of the ſpeech with having left the land-marks of hiſtory in their "old ſober ſtation," and of courſe in the very "ſober "ſtation," in which it would be the wiſh of every honeſt man that they ſhould for ever remain. In page 3, however, the "illuſtrious" critic makes a charge againſt the ſame author, of having, in the purſuit of his plan, of keeping the "landmarks of hiſtory in their old ſober "ſtation," offered "*nothing like extent of erudition*," and that he has likewiſe ſhown nothing like "*force of imagi-*"*nation.*" What ideas this critic had annexed to the words, "extent of erudition," when he conſidered a ſummary ſtatement of the leading facts, in the miſerable political wrangles of a petty Iſland, in an obſcure ſtation, as a field for the diſplay of "extent of erudition," I believe the reader would do

right

right to apply to your Lordſhip for aſſiſtance in the diſcovery. But how far "*force of imagination*" may be uſeful in the narration of hiſtorical facts, or by what ſteps, at leaſt, our critic had been trained to conſider it as uſeful in ſuch undertakings, will not, perhaps, be found a matter involved in much obſcurity.

In a publication which appeared in the year 1797, and entitled, "Mr. Grattan's Addreſs to his (THEN) Fellow-"citizens," I find a very ſhort paſſage, which appears to me to ſpeak on this ſubject much and ſtrongly. It is (p. 45) as follows: "the Romans were conquered at Cannæ, *firſt* "*by Varro*, and afterwards by Hannibal. The Engliſh "have been conquered firſt by the Miniſter, and afterwards "by the French." "Thoſe Romans were finally con-"quered by the barbarians of the North, becauſe they had "been previouſly conquered by the princes of the Empire;" "and then the half-armed ſavage, with the *pike* and the *pole*, "came down on the frontier, and diſpoſed of the Maſters of "the World as of the ſtock of the land." In reading this paſſage, I was, I confeſs, my Lord, at firſt confounded. The fact of *Varro having conquered the Romans* had eſcaped my memory; but as the Roman ſtory, under your Lordſhip's tuition, had made part of the "ſtudies of my childhood," I thought it was probable ſome illuſtration of this ſingular aſſertion might be obtained, by reſorting again to the ſame ſtory as the "amuſement of my age." Accordingly I turned to Livy and Polybius. The particulars of the progreſs of Varro, as they appear in theſe authorities, may be given in a few words.

C. Terentius Varro was born of a family, obſcure even among the Plebeians. Vain of himſelf, envious of others, factious in his temper, ſuperficial in his acquirements, he deſerted the trade of his father, and became an agitator in the

the aſſembly of the people. There every good, and every elevated magiſtrate, became, becauſe he was good and elevated, to Varro an object of *traduction* *; and every meaſure which tended to wreſt the power of the ſtate from the hands of the noble and the rich, and to veſt it in thoſe of the profligate and the poor, received therefore from Varro an invariable ſupport.

THE maſter of horſe was, during a dictatorſhip, the ſecond officer in rank at Rome, but DEPENDENT upon, *annexed*, and ſubordinate to the general control of the *head of the Empire*—i. e. the dictator. When the people were aſſembled to hear the agitation of the famous law, by which the maſter of horſe (in the time of Fabius Maximus) notwithſtanding he was *annexed to* and *dependent* upon the dictator, was to be rendered *equal* and *independent*, yet ſtill to remain annexed to and *dependent* upon, although many from envy to the dictator, and many from the love of change deſired it, yet no perſon of authority could be found daring enough to propoſe it as a law. Varro was preciſely fitted for ſuch a purpoſe. His boldneſs was of a peculiar caſt: the effect, not of natural courage, but of profligate principles and ſuperficial knowledge. The firſt relieving him from every moral reſtraint, and the laſt concealing from him every dangerous conſequence. Varro therefore propoſed the law, and, as it is not difficult to perſuade folly to gratify itſelf, Varro ſucceeded. But as folly ever attributes effects to wrong cauſes, the people of Rome gave to the eloquence of Varro that which was the direct production

* The word, TRADUCTION, was never, until the writing of our learned critic, (anſwer to Lord Clare, p. 2) uſed to ſignify calumniation. Having, however, been ſent abroad by him in that ſenſe, it is fair to return it to him in the ſame ſenſe.

production of their own madneſs. From this circumſtance we date the riſe of Varro.

—— Primum in notitiam populi,
Deinde ad honores pervenit.

LIV. LIB. 22, c. 26.

His political courſe from this period was ſhort, but at the ſame time ſtrongly marked. The effects of the law which he had obtained were ſo injurious, that modes were immediately deviſed (by the voluntary conformity of the conduct of the Maſter of Horſe, to the general direction of the Dictator) to relieve the Romans from the ruin which the practical execution of ſo abſurd a principle would have drawn upon the ſtate. But the links by which Varro had connected himſelf to the paſſions of the multitude, were not completely broken; and he continued, by the uſual artifice, of gratifying their malignity,

" Proclamando
" pro ſordidis hominibus cauſiſque,
" adverſus rem et famam bonorum."

LIV. LIB. 22, c. 26.

to increaſe his influence and his power, until his countrymen, by following the raſhneſs of his councils, were plunged into a conflict, in which, as

" Feſtinatio improvida eſt et cæca."

LIV. IBID.

not leſs than forty thouſand of them loſt their lives. Raſhneſs in opinion is always timid when the hour of perſonal danger arrives. Varro perfectly fulfilled the obſervation, and fled from that field of blood into which his ſelf-confidence had plunged his country; while his hapleſs colleague, the gallant Emilius Paulus, whoſe mildneſs, and caution

in council, would have averted the misfortune, diſdained, as a brave man, to ſurvive that ſlaughter, which, as a wiſe man, he would have prevented, and obſtinately refuſed to ſuffer himſelf to be carried from that field, which Varro had upon the firſt onſet deſerted*. But why ſhould I dwell on Emilius Paulus! "he has received his fame."

——— Animæque magnæ
Prodigum, Pæno ſuperante, Paulum.
HOR.

THE moſt awful teacher that has ever inflicted his leſſons on the human mind, had made your Lordſhip very early in life too well acquainted with the firſt of Roman hiſtorians, for me to attempt to impoſe any exaggerated account of thoſe mutually combined effects, the *riſe* of Varro and the *fall* of his country, upon your Lordſhip. You will perceive, my Lord, at a glance, that I have done ſcarcely any thing more than to bring together, in almoſt a literal tranſlation, a few detached paſſages of Livy.

PERMIT me now to aſk of your Lordſhip, how does it appear, according to the aſſertion of your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend," that *Varro conquered the Romans?*" In no other way can I conceive it, my Lord, than by applying to the leſſon we ſhould draw from hiſtory, that inſtrument which the illuſtrious critic deems of ſuch ſingular utility in hiſtory itſelf—"*force of imagination*;" and, indeed, by this help, we may conceive how any beſotted people, who blindly ſubmit themſelves and their affairs to the guidance of a ſelfiiſh demagogue, whoſe courage is his virulence, and whoſe wiſdom is his audacity, may be truly ſaid to be "*conquered*;" and ſuch a people will

* The unlearned reader will pleaſe to obſerve, that it was not to Llanrwyſt or Twickenham that Varro fled, but to Venuſia; and that it was not from Dublin, but from Cannæ.

will certainly feel all the miſeries of the moſt debaſing conqueſt, in weakneſs abroad, and in violence at home.

I cannot, my Lord, entirely depart from the paſſage in the "illuſtrious" critic's addreſs, to which I have alluded, without endeavouring to call your Lordſhip's attention to this latter part of it: "Thoſe Romans were finally con-"quered by the *barbarians* of the North, becauſe they had "been previouſly conquered by the princes of the empire;" "and then the half-armed ſavage, with THE PIKE AND "THE POLE, came down on the frontiers, and diſpoſed of "the maſters of the world, as of the ſtock of the land." Here, my Lord, you perceive the uſe of "force of ima-"gination" in hiſtory; here, my Lord, by the dexterous uſe of hiſtorical dioptricks, our "illuſtrious" critic did ſo refract the rays proceeding from the ſword and the ſhield of the Northern, and the bow and the ſcymitar of the Eaſtern ſavages, who extinguiſhed the glory, and obliterated the ſcience of the Roman world, that he produced in the awful year, 1797, the familiar and enticing images of THE PIKE AND THE POLE triumphant over the ſcattered fragments of the Roman eagle, to the dazzled eyes of General Father O'Egan, and Colonel Father O'Plunket. Was it his love of "CONCILIATION" which led him, like another Hecate, to conjure up before the eyes of thoſe worthies, (whoſe families are ſo well known, and whoſe names and views are ſo familiar to your Lordſhip) the ſhadowy forms of fiends, whoſe cruelties had formerly ravaged and deſolated "the faireſt portions of the earth? Were the PIKE AND THE POLE placed in their hands, to familiarize the tremendous prophecy which they were to pronounce; to ſhew to the United Iriſhmen, that what has been, might be; and that in ſome future Runics, the names of Paddy and of Darby, might vie with the barbaric ma-

jeſty of Attila, and the awful ferocity of Theodoric? Were theſe the marks of loyalty to his prince, and of "*con-* " *ciliation*" to the people, which could induce any new-coined nobleman to call our learned critic "his illuſtrious " friend;" and to pay to his loyalty and humanity, in the firſt aſſembly of the land, the tribute of applauſe? Are theſe the virtues, my Lord, with which Iriſh Nobility preſſes gratuitouſly forward to acknowledge its intimacy? But, perhaps, I am miſtaken, when I charge the illuſtrious critic with ſuch a conduct, and with having profeſſed himſelf a " *conciliator*," in the modern ſenſe of the word. What ſort of inviſible and internal *conciliation* that is, the external and palpable fruit of which has been conſpiracy, treaſon, and rebellion, I own, as a modern, I am a loſs to diſcover. But, perhaps, I am miſtaken; and, perhaps, your Lordſhip, whoſe claſſic acquirements are at leaſt equal to thoſe of the illuſtrious" critic, may help me out: Perhaps the deep impreſſion of Roman meanings on the mind of the " illuſtrious critic," may have led him to uſe this word *conciliate* in a ſenſe which, I am afraid, the rudeneſs of our home-ſpun Engliſh idiom has hardly yet acknowledged.

Exiſtimabatur enim Servilia etiam ſuam Tertiam Cæſare CONCILARE.
SUETONIUS, LIB. I, S. 51.

Conciliatrices et *conciliatores* lenones vocantur. *Conciliaturas facere* eſt *lenocinium* exercere. LIPSIUS.

In this *claſſical* ſenſe of the word, *conciliator*, we may diſcover ſome figurative agreement between our " illuſ- " ous" critic's conduct, and his expreſſion. By the uſe of his own inſtrument, " force of imagination," we may conceive a mean and unprincipled demagogue, either for his own, or (like Pandarus) for the gratification of others, entering into an intrigue with the people; and by playing upon the lewdeſt

lewdeſt and groſſeſt of their paſſions, ſeducing them to yield their peace and happineſs to his purpoſes. In ſuch a caſe, my Lord, ſuch a claſſical mind as that of our "illuſtrious" critic, may well be allowed to denominate ſuch a tranſaction, *conciliation*, and ſuch a pandar, a *conciliator;* and, my Lord, as from ſuch a connexion, the ordinary produce has been jealouſy on the one hand, and treachery on the other; ſo we may, by the "force of imagination," be allowed to conceive how, in ſuch a political *conciliation*, a profligate favourite of the people having, by the baſeſt arts, ſeduced them from their loyalty, may have been afterwards, upon the returning conſciouſneſs of their duty, "disfranchiſed "by them as a traitor."

Allow me, my Lord, to detain your attention for a few moments longer on the paſſage in our "illuſtrious" critic's addreſs, which I have quoted. He is pleaſed there, in the moſt direct terms, to aſſert, that "the Engliſh have "been" (and in the preſent war too) "*conquered by the* "*French.*" This aſſertion, your Lordſhip will perceive, is nothing leſs than a very daring ſpecies of that figure in rhetoric, which, in the pliant combination of the greek, is called Ψευδολόγια, in the more rigid innocence of the houhynhum language, is expreſſed by the periphraſis of ſaying the thing which "is not;" and in our coarſe and direct teutonic dialect, is denominated a lie. It is a lie, my Lord; and I hope, notwithſtanding any partiality for your "illuſ-"trious friend," which may preſs upon your Lordſhip's feelings, that your Lordſhip will acknowledge it is a lie. But independent of its falſehood, it is an aſſertion of that offenſive nature to our (I mean, my Lord, his Majeſty's loyal ſubject's) ears, that I remember the time, and you, my Lord, who are an older man, (inaſmuch as I had the honour of going to ſchool to your Lordſhip, and have

now

now in my poſſeſſion a "*quod Teſtor* Barry Yelverton," which I value very highly) may therefore well remember the time when, if any man, even if the fact had been true, had dared to make ſuch an aſſertion in the ſtreets, either of London or Dublin, not a coal-porter's fiſt, either on the quays of the one, or the wharfs of the other, but would have been inſtantly wielded in the execution of a righteous and loyal judgment; which, though it might have been more ſummary in its proceſs, would have been as ſtrongly founded in national juſtice, as any decree of the court of Exchequer is in the technical law of the land. And that your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" has hitherto eſcaped the execution of ſuch a righteous judgment, can only be attributed to the "illuſtrious" protection which he muſt have derived in common with Bartle Hoare, Jack Egan, and George Jennings, from your Lordſhip's friendſhip to his perſon, and approbation of his principles. For ſuch protection, as your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious" approbation and applauſe, ſome degree of gratitude, at leaſt, ſhould have been paid by thoſe who have enjoyed it. How has this illuſtrious friend of your Lordſhip manifeſted the exiſtence of ſuch a virtue in his breaſt? It is reported, that your Lordſhip did ſomewhere aſſert of the kingdom of Ireland, that (p. 27) "from the reign of James the "firſt we muſt date the *commencement* of a government "regularly organized, and of parliaments ſolemnly hold-"en." My Lord, this declaration of your Lordſhip, if it ſhould have been ſo delivered by your Lordſhip, muſt have been known to your "illuſtrious friend" at the time he wrote his laſt production; and how has your "illuſtrious friend" marked his reſpect and gratitude to your Lordſhip? Why, my Lord, under pretence of anſwering the writer of a pamphlet, entitled a ſpeech of the Earl of Clare, your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" has openly publiſhed, that this declaration of your Lordſhip's, is a "ſlander" (p. 2)

againſt

againſt the "lineage of our liberties;" that it is "a *tra-* "*duction* of the inheritance of the realm, a calumny againſt "her antiquities, and a falſification of her title." Your "illuſtrious friend" does not ſcruple to ſay, of your Lordſhip's opinion, that the "boldneſs of the aſſertion is ren- "dered the more remarkable, by the diſtinguiſhed fee- "bleneſs of *its* reaſoning. Here, my Lord, you are repreſented as a ſlanderer, a TRADUCTIONER, a calumniator, a bold aſſertor, and a feeble reaſoner. My Lord, if you call this gratitude, or even reſpect, I ſhall be ready to admit that your "illuſtrious friend's" former conduct has been *conciliation;* but, my Lord, let me ſpeak freely to your Lordſhip: If avarice and ambition, cowardice and ingratitude, pull with *equal* powers, and from *oppoſite* points of the human heart, it will require as profound ſkill in morals, to diſcover virtue exiſting in ſuch a *centre*, as has lately been exhibited to us in phyſics, by a truly *Iriſh* Sir Iſaac Newton, when he diſcloſed to a wondering world, that *weight* could exiſt in the centre of gravity; i. e. in a point from which attraction was *equal* on all ſides*.

My Lord, the involution of your "illuſtrious friend's" imagination is ſuch, that it is impoſſible to follow him in any ſteady line of rational deduction; we muſt catch him as he lights, or ſtrike him as he flies. Your "illuſtrious "friend" is pleaſed to (p. 38, fifth edition of anſwer) to quote the pamphlet called Lord Clare's ſpeech, for an aſſertion, that the ſtruggle of 1753, "tranſmitted a ſpirit "that afterwards degraded Parliament." Your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend," the disfranchiſed Citizen, then ſays, with his own claſſic energy, "what, when, or where "this

* Like a *weight*, at the centre of gravity, which is ſo equally attracted on all ſides, that it cannot incline to any.

" this parliamentary degradation appeared, *we are at a loſs* " *to diſcover.*" My Lord, to the queſtion, *what* " this par- " liamentary degradation appeared," I own I am not able to give an anſwer, becauſe I am unable to diſcover its meaning; but when and where an account of this parliamentary degration appeared, your Lordſhip, and your " illuſtrious friend," need not be long at *a loſs to diſcover.* My Lord, in a book called Parliamentary Debates, vol. 11, p. 394, your Lordſhip will find it aſſerted, upon no leſs authority than a man, who it is ſaid, in a book with your Lordſhip's name in the front, was " disfranchiſed as a " traitor," and yet is at the ſame time aſſerted to be your Lordſhip's " illuſtrious friend;" that " this country was " *robbed* in 1758, by additions to her penſion liſt, amounting " to 30,000*l.* per annum,——in the years lapſing from " 1776 to 1778, this country was *ſold* by additions to her " penſion liſt, amounting to 29,000*l.* per annum." Give me leave to aſk your Lordſhip, is not Parliament the proper guardian of the public purſe? And if Parliment permitted the country firſt to be *robbed*, and then to be *ſold*, are not theſe inſtances of Parliamentary degradation? But, my Lord, there is another inſtance which appeared to many, to combine in itſelf both a *robbery* and *ſale* of the country; and therefore may, in times of ſuch free aſſertion as the preſent, be called an inſtance of *Parliamentary degradation.* I mean, my Lord, when Parliament, in the year 1782, upon the motion of a madman, voted 50,000*l.* to be paid to a citizen, who, it is aſſerted under the authority of your Lordſhip's name, has been ſince " diſ- " franchiſed as a traitor." My Lord, I do not now intend to enter into any enquiry, whether the alledged ſervice of the disfranchiſed Citizen, your Lordſhip's " il- " luſtrious friend," were, if performed, really worth 50,000*l.* or not. All I ſhall contend for is, (and that under

under the authority of the " illuſtrious disfranchiſed" Citizen himſelf) that the ſervice was *not* performed by him.

My Lord, in page 30, fifth edition of his anſwer, he ſtates, that on the queſtion, whether the repeal of 6 Geo. I. was an attainment of the object then ſought, the people changed their mind; and he admits that they did ſo, " under the authority of an experienced and conſummate " ſenator, of ſeveral reſpectable lawyers, of a corps ſtyling " itſelf a corps of lawyers, enrolling the name of ſeveral " reſpectable barriſters, &c." He might have added, my Lord, that a committee was appointed, compoſed of the very firſt lawyers then in the profeſſion, (of which the preſent Baron Sir Mich. Smith, and the preſent Mr. Juſtice Chamberlain, were two) to give their opinion on the point; and the committee did report their opinion, that the repeal of 6 Geo. I. was *not* an attainment of the object of the Iriſh legiſlature; and, by neceſſary conſequence, that the tranſactions of 1782, did not amount to a FINAL ſettlement even of the point then at iſſue.

Here then, my Lord, is the opinion (ſtated by himſelf) of the whole people of Ireland, ſupported by that of a moſt " experienced and conſummate ſenator," the whole corps of lawyers, enlightened by the report of a ſelection of the ableſt profeſſors of the time, that the *ſervice was not performed*, for which the ſum of 50,000*l.* was claimed by, and paid to the " illuſtrious" disfranchiſed Citizen. My Lord, I admit, the disfranchiſed Citizen ſays, that he himſelf was of a different opinion; I admit alſo, he ſays, that ſome legal authorities were of his opinion. Who the authorities were, (and conſidering the corps he has brought in array againſt himſelf, they could not have been very numerous) he has not ventured to diſcloſe; but, my Lord, I will do

it for him. I believe he was ſupported againſt the bar, the bench, and the people of Ireland, by a practiſing barriſter, then Attorney General, and the moſt *erudite* Mr. (ſince Baron) Peter Metge. Theſe perſonages had been partners with him in the manufacture; they were men of round-robin honour; they would not deſert their brother weaver in the day of payment; they vouched for the quality of the ſtuff. But, my Lord, againſt the opinion of *his own partners*, I repoſe on the authority of three men, who have ſince diſtinguiſhed themſelves as the ableſt judges of their time; the late Sir Samuel Bradſtreet, the preſent Baron Sir M. Smith, and the preſent Juſtice Chamberlain, the whole corps of lawyers, the moſt conſummate and experienced ſenator of his day, the declaration of all the good ſenſe of Ireland, and the acknowledgment of the doctrine by the parliament of Great Britain, in the following year, by the act of renunciation. After ſuch an enumeration, may I not venture to aſk your Lordſhip, whether (even if the ſervice had been performed) the grant I have ſtated, was not an act totally without precedent, and moſt dangerous as an example? and whether, inaſmuch as the ſervice was not performed, the grant does not remain a monument of human folly, a vicious abuſe of public truſt, and conſequently one anſwer to your "illuſtrious friend's" queſtion of where the inſtances of parliamentary degradation are to be diſcovered?

Does your "illuſtrious friend" want more inſtances? He ſhall have them upon authority, which he ought not to queſtion.

In his addreſs of 1795, he ſtates that it had been aſſerted in reply to himſelf, that "the borough conſtitution had "worked well ſince 1782." In anſwer to that aſſertion, the

the "illuſtrious disfranchiſed" Citizen makes the following obſervations: "As far as that boaſt goes to politieal meaſures, we cannot ſo well expreſs our *deteſtation* of them as by the *recital*——the propoſitions, the new taxes without trade—the new debt, notwithſtanding the new taxes —the ſale of the peerage—the ſurrender of the Eaſt India trade for the re-export trade—the refuſal of the re-export trade without ſuch barter, &c.—the bar bill—the convention bill—the gun-powder bill—the indemnity bill—the ſuſpenſion of the habeas corpus, &c. &c.—and *above all*, the ſuppreſſion of a *free* PRESS *. Such has been the workings of the borough ſyſtem." "It is the cauſe, and the *poiſon* which has made ſome men mad and all men ſick." †

My Lord, will you have the goodneſs to anſwer for your "illuſtrious friend," and ſay whether he intended to enumerate theſe facts as inſtances of Parliamentary degradation or not? But, my Lord, the disfranchiſed Citizen has had the boldneſs to contend, that this grant of 50,000*l.* was not an inſtance of Parliamentary degradation. He inſiſts, that Parliament could not then be degraded, becauſe Parliament was then (to adopt his own ſtile) "in *contact* with the people."

Was this Parliamentary *contact* with the people proved by any expreſs popular approbation of the grant of 50,000*l.*?—the very reverſe. The disfranchiſed Citizen himſelf admits, in his anſwer to Lord Clare's ſuppoſed ſpeech, that the whole people of Ireland, led by the ſcience of

* Viz. the Northern Star.

† Yet the illuſtrious disfranchiſed Citizen now ſays, that all he formerly ſaid of the working of the borough ſyſtem, applied to the Parliament of James I. and not to any ſubſequent Parliament.

the bar, and the experience of the ſenate, declared the tranſaction of 1782 to be a fraud, and that the ſervice had never been performed. If the Parliament then in that *particular* inſtance, were not in "*contact*" with the people, was the *general* conduct of Parliament then in *contact* with the people? To determine this queſtion, permit me to remind your Lordſhip of one circumſtance, which your "falter in fact" friend ſeems for years to have forgotten.

On the 22d of February, 1782, your Lordſhip's "falter in fact" friend made a motion "for an addreſs to "his Majeſty, that the people of Ireland are a free people, "&c. that Ireland is a diſtinct kingdom, with a Parliament "of her own, the ſole Legiſlature thereof, &c." On this motion, the "falter in fact" mover was in a minority of 69. The numbers being againſt him 137, and with him 68. A motion to the ſame purpoſe was repeated on the next day with no better ſucceſs. Your Lordſhip will recollect, that in February, 1782, Lord North's Government was ſtill in being, and *againſt* acknowledging the independency of Ireland—that in the month of March following, Lord North's Government having been turned out, and Lord Rockingham's having come in, declared themſelves ready to *admit* the independency of Ireland, and accordingly ſent a meſſage to the Iriſh Parliament for that purpoſe by the Duke of Portland. What followed? The ſame Parliament, which in the very month before had voted *againſt* the declaration of Iriſh right, did, on the *invitation* of the *Miniſter*, vote in terms a declaration ſimilar to that which they had rejected. It is notorious, that a declaration of the independeney of Ireland had been earneſtly ſought for by the people of Ireland from 1778 to 1782. If then a Parliament in February, 1782, when the *Miniſter* was *againſt* the meaſure, voted *againſt* the declaration of right,

and

and in little more than a month following, where, by a political change, a *Miniſter* had become for the meaſure, Parliament ſhould then vote *for* it, would it not, my Lord, require a "falter in fact" face, and a "falter in fact" heart, to ſay, that ſuch a Parliament was in *contact* with *people*?

THE author of the pamphlet, called your Lordſhip's ſpeech, has been pleaſed to call the disfranchiſement of his "illuſtrious friend," the act of an "*intemperate corporation* *.

MY Lord, at the time I was at Doctor Leland's ſchool, and when your Lordſhip was ſent out at the head of the boys to take their evening walk, I remember your Lordſhip would not permit us to paſs a ſheriff, an alderman, or a clergyman, without pulling off our hats. Reſpect inſtilled ſo early, becomes by habit as much a ſenſation of the nerves, as a concluſion of the mind. I am, therefore, ſhocked, when I meet with a groſs and indecent term, ſuppoſed to fall from noble and virtuous lips, and applied to the firſt corporation in the kingdom, acting as a court of juſtice, and pronouncing a ſentence on a ſubject in which they had competent juriſdiction: a ſentence too, my Lord, ſuffered to remain unreverſed. If ſuch unlicenſed railing ſhould grow into faſhion againſt (to adopt the phraſeology of the friends of your illuſtrious friend) "conſtituted au-" thorities," God knows, my Lord, where it may reach! I who ſo ſincerely reverence all "public functionaries," may live to hear even the graceful accompliſhments, and profound learning of your valued friend, Jack Egan, or even the dignified manners, and immoveable ſweetneſs of temper of ſome future Chief Baron of the Exchequer, ſubmitted

* The act of an *intemperate* corporation, whoſe cenſure could no more depreciate, than their applauſe could enhance the value of a character which will always ſuſtain itſelf.

mitted to the profanation of opprobrious epithets. But, my Lord, permit me to ſay, it is not an intemperate expreſſion falling from intemperate lips, no nor an intemperate and ungramatical letter, written even to ſo intimate and ſteady a friend as the printer of the Courier, which can clear away the ſtain that ſentences of disfranchiſement pronounced by the Corporations of Dublin and Londonderry, upon any man as a fomenter of ſedition, muſt affix upon his character; more eſpecially, if an act of his Majeſty, in his Privy Council, ſhould ſeem, both in time and purpoſe, to correſpond with thoſe ſentences. Permit me to ſay, my Lord, that though the mere exerciſe of franchiſe might not be a ſufficient inducement to a Gentleman to reſort to a legal remedy againſt an unjuſt ſentence, yet that under the circumſtances I have mentioned, a mandamus from the Court of King's Bench would have been a much more honourable juſtification, than a letter to an intimate friend, like the printer of the Courier. I am aſtoniſhed that this remedy eſcaped the attention of the "illuſtrious" disfranchiſed Citizen, as he ſeems, in his letter to the Courier, ſo fully aware of the advantage which he might enjoy in the want of LEGAL evidence to convict him, be the degree of his guilt or innocence in a *moral* point of view what it may. But, my Lord, though the want of *legal* evidence againſt a criminal would, in the public judgment of the Court of King's Bench, be a matter of great importance, yet, in the private conſcience of Lord Yelverton, who is a profound caſuiſt, as well as an eminent lawyer, ſuch a circumſtance would avail but little. And I cannot think that his Lordſhip would conclude in *moral* eſtimation, the innocence of any man demonſtrated, who ſhould happen fully to prove that he was *not* a traitor, merely becauſe he was a coward. But, my Lord, this disfranchiſement has been called by the high authority of ſome

ſome perſons uſing your Lordſhip's name, the act of an *intemperate* corporation. My Lord, does that writer mean to inſinuate indirectly, that the act of his Majeſty in Council, in ſtriking off your "illuſtrious friend's" name, was an *intemperate* act? If ſo, God help the lovers of port. I have known a grave and reverend Chief Judge drink more port in a month, than I believe His Majeſty, God bleſs him! ever drank in a year.

It is laborious, or tedious, to follow the "illuſtrious friend" of the author of Lord Yelverton's ſpeech through the ſtagnant element of his own politics, where he ſometimes plunges ſo deep, and ſometimes floats ſo ſupinely. In this laſt production of his (the anſwer to Lord Clare's ſpeech) he ſeems to have imitated the dexterity of ſome perſonages, whoſe talents Addiſon has taken notice of, where he ſays, "Our diſputants put me in mind of the "ſkuttle-fiſh, that, when he is unable to extricate himſelf, "blackens all the water about him till he becomes inviſible." Permit me therefore, my Lord, to lay ſhortly before you ſuch parts of the account of his actions, and of his aſſertions, as I can ſnatch from the muddy ſea of falſe grammar, and falſe metaphor, in which he has caſt them.

As to the illuſtrious diſfranchiſed Citizen's general conception of moral principles,

First, it is "falter in fact" morality for any man to conſider an "obligation to fact," as a "*ſordid*" tendency of the mind.

VIDE P. 30, FIRST EDITION P. 38, 5TH ED. ANSWER TO LORD CLARE.

It is "falter in fact" morality for any man to inſiſt, that others ſhould obſerve the rule of telling the *whole truth*, and at the ſame time indulge himſelf in ſinking a conſidera-

ble

ble part of the truth, becauſe it may anſwer his purpoſe to do ſo. For inſtance, in p. 21, 1ſt edition of his anſwer, your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" ſays of the pamphlet called Lord Clare's ſpeech, in adverting to the report of the evidence of the priſoners, (O'Connor, &c.) examined by the Secret Committees, and in ſtating that O'Connor approved of the plan of reform in Parliament, that "it ſhould have "ſtated the *whole truth*, or have ſtated nothing." "It "has ſuppreſſed their declaration; which was, that had "that plan taken place, (viz. the reform of Parliament) "they would have broken off their connection with "France." Now, it is true, that Lord Clare's ſpeech does omit that part of the report, containing this declaration of the traitors. And it is true, that your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" ſupplies the omiſſion. But, it is likewiſe true, that your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" himſelf *omits* to ſtate a very material part of the report, which will immediately appear, by inſerting the *whole* paragraph as it ſtands in the Lord's Report, viz. "It was further "alledged, by the ſeveral perſons who ſo acknowledged "their traitorous connexion with France, that the imme-"diate cauſe of their eſtabliſhing a reſident agent at Paris, "was the rejection of a plan of reform which was pro-"poſed in 1797, in the Houſe of Commons; which plan, "they ſaid, would have ſatisfied the people. *But the pal-"pable falſehood of this aſſertion, appears by the journals of the "Houſe of Commons; for theſe perſons have all confeſſed, that "their reſident agent was diſpatched by them to Paris in* APRIL "1797, *with inſtructions to negociate a treaty with the Directory "of France; and the propoſition for parliamentary reform, to the "rejection of which they pretend to aſcribe the miſſion of Lewins, "was not made till the* 15*th* OF MAY, 1797." All that part of the report above quoted, and printed in italics, your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" *omits*, while he is cenſuring the

the author of Lord Clare's ſpeech, for not telling the *whole* truth. Permit me now to trace the intention of thoſe two omiſſions. The author of the pamphlet called Lord Clare's ſpeech, does not ſtate this declaration of the traitors, inaſmuch as the inſertion of it would have been utterly idle and immaterial, the falſehood of it being demonſtrated by the evidence of record in the Journals of the Commons. Your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend" inſerts this declaration of the traitors, but utterly omits to ſtate the recorded evidence of its *falſehood*. Now, why did your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious friend," in the very moment that he bellowed for the *whole truth* of the declaration of the traitors, himſelf omit to ſtate the recorded evidence of the falſehood of that declaration? Is this the inflexible adherence to fact, which entitles him to be called your Lordſhip's "illuſtrious "friend?" Is this the pure and honourable morality which entitles him to be called the "illuſtrious friend" of an exalted nobleman? Is this the evidence of that ardent loyalty, which entitles him to be called the "illuſ- "trious friend" of one of his Majeſty's Chief Judges? Or is it ſomething elſe, than either ſober truth, or proud honour, which entitles a man to "illuſtrious friendſhips?" Is it in miſuſed affluence, originally torn from the ſmall reſources of poverty, on the propoſition of a madman, and by the hands of corruption, that we find this title to "illuſtrious friendſhip?"

Or is it an artful endeavour, by putting forth only a part of the report of the confeſſion of traitors, and, by concealing the remainder, to ſoften their guilt, by giving them a more popular cauſe for murder and aſſaſſination, that we are to look for a title to "illuſtrious friendſhip?" Is this evidence, that "illuſtrious friends" had no melting gentle pity in their minds, towards the ſufferings of convicted traitors?

I HAVE done, my Lord, ; yet, I cannot avoid aſking, was it merely the love of ingenious paradox, which induced the writer of the pamphlet called Lord Yelverton's ſpeech, to endeavour to illuminate ſuch a little Nebula of virtue, by the rays of noble panegyric? If ſo, in the name of decency, let him the next time give us an eulogium on the mental purity of Sir John Blaquiere, or the perſonal cleanlineſs of Sir John Parnell. Theſe, my Lord, will be, at leaſt, as innoxious exerciſes, as the beauty and humanity of Horace Walpole's Richard the Third.

MY Lord, I have not ſaid hitherto one word on the opinions reſpecting the Union, expreſſed in the pamphlet called Lord Yelverton's ſpeech. It is but juſtice now to ſay, that I, in common with a great number of humble, but honeſt men, agree with the writer on that part of this ſubject. And (if your Lordſhip ſhould be the author, which we by no means preſume to ſuppoſe) we pray to God, for the ſake of your Lordſhip and the public, that it may long continue to be your Lordſhip's *intereſt* to perſevere in ſuch opinions. In ſaying ſo, my Lord, I do not preſume to convey the ſlighteſt hint on the regency.

I AM, MY LORD,

YOUR LORDSHIP'S SINCERE WELL-WISHER,

AND FORMER PUPIL,

HYPODIDASCALUS.